

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 1-7 and 9-15 have been canceled, claim 8 has been amended, and new claims 16-17 have been added. Claims 8, 16, and 17 remain pending in this application.

Formal matters

The title of the invention has been objected to as being non-descriptive. In response, Applicant has amended the Specification (on pages 1 and 8) in order to change the title from "Supply unit" to "Supply unit for identifying and powering a LED unit, and method therefor."

The Drawing has been objected to because it fails to include proper identifiers. As an initial matter, Examiner has noted that the Drawing should be labeled "Figure 1." In response, Applicant has amended the Drawing to include the legend "Figure 1." A corrected drawing sheet (labeled "Replacement Sheet") that incorporates the aforementioned change is attached herein as an appendix (immediately following page 7).

With further regard to the Drawing, Examiner has also asserted that all components in the Drawing should be provided with a proper text label. In order to request clarification on this point, Applicant's agent (Kenneth D. Labudda) telephoned Examiner Blount on April 29, 2005. Examiner Blount advised that, although not strictly required, it would be desirable (e.g., for purposes of clarity) to have a descriptive text label for at least certain elements (e.g., those designated by reference numbers 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11) in the Drawing. Applicant's agent advised that, if feasible, he would attempt to add descriptive text labels in the manner requested by Examiner. Upon further investigation, Applicant's agent is of the opinion that it is not feasible to add descriptive text labels in the manner suggested by Examiner. Applicant respectfully

submits that the Drawing, as amended, is in full compliance with all formal requirements, inasmuch as all reference designators in the Drawing are fully described and explained in the specification. Nevertheless, Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent if further clarification or changes are required.

Claims 5, 6, and 12 have been objected to due to various informalities. These objections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 112(2) as being indefinite due to repeated instances of the term "small." In response, Applicant has amended claim 8 to cure the aforementioned problems. More particularly, claim 8 has been amended to: (i) replace the recitation "small with respect to the LED impedance" with the recitation "substantially less than an impedance of the LED unit"; and (ii) replace the recitation "small with respect to the LED impedance" with the recitation "substantially less than an impedance of the LED unit." Additionally, Applicant has made various other changes (relative to the original language of claims 4 and 8) so as to enhance the clarity and definiteness of amended claim 8. Thus, as amended, claim 8 now appears to be in compliance with all formal requirements.

Substantive matters

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of de Leijer (U.S. Patent 6,236,170). These rejections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims.

Claims 8, 11, and 12 have been indicated as allowable with certain provisos. In response:

(a) Claim 8 has been recast in independent form to include all limitations of its base claim 4. Additionally, as previously discussed, the language of claim 8 has been appropriately

amended in order to cure all formal problems noted by Examiner, as well as any potential formal problems identified by Applicant. Thus, claim 8 is now in a condition for allowance.

(b) Claims 11 and 12 have been canceled.

(c) New claims 16 and 17 have been added by the present amendment. Applicant notes that the subject matter of claim 16 is substantially analogous to that of claim 5 (which has been canceled), and that the subject matter of claim 17 is substantially analogous to that of claim 6 (which has also been canceled). As new claims 16 and 17 are dependent on claim 8, they are allowable on that basis alone. Moreover, new claims 16 and 17 include additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 8, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. New claims 16 and 17 have been carefully drafted in order to cure any formal problems (e.g., the term "it") that were originally present in claims 5 and 6. Accordingly, new claims 16 and 17 are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

Thus, claims 8, 16, and 17 are now in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service as
first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On 05/03/2005
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 05/03/05
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,
Gotthard Schleicher

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 05/03/2005
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
Phone: (847) 726-6448
FAX: (847) 726-6599